

BOROUGH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held at the New Council Chamber - Town Hall, Reigate on 8 June 2022 at 7.30 pm.

Present: Councillors J. Baker, M. S. Blacker, P. Chandler, Z. Cooper, P. Harp, A. King, J. P. King, S. A. Kulka, S. McKenna, R. Michalowski, S. Parnall, C. Stevens, D. Torra, S. T. Walsh and N. D. Harrison (Substitute).

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED that Councillor Parnall; having been proposed by Councillor Walsh, and seconded by Councillor Blacker, be elected as Chairman of the Planning Committee for the 2022-23 municipal year.

2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED that Councillor Blacker; having been proposed by Councillor Michalowski, and seconded by Councillor J King, be elected as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee for the 2022-23 municipal year.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 27 April 2022 be approved as a correct record.

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence had been received from Councillor Bray, Councillor Harrison attended as her substitute.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA

RESOLVED that the addendum be noted.

7. 21/03303/F - TITAN HOUSE, CROSSOAK LANE, SALFORDS

The Committee considered an application at Titan House, Crossoak Lane, Salfords for the demolition of existing buildings (2) and the erection of two any industrial processes (class e (g) (iii)), general industrial (use class b2) storage and/or distribution (use class b8) units with ancillary office accommodation, together with other associated parking, servicing landscape and infrastructure.

Jim Blackmore, Vice-Chair at Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application stating that the Parish Council had met with the developers however they were unable to concur on matters. Their main concerns were the impact on residents in Empire Villas and traffic. The site was on the border of Horley and Salfords and Sidlow and both councils had objected to this proposal. The site was allocated for business use however they questioned the scale of

development and whether it was needed or appropriate considering the recently developed North Gatwick Gateway site which was situated opposite. The scale of the development was not in keeping with the area. Residents in Empire Villas would be affected by the size and scale of the development, notably their severe reduction in light compared to the existing site layout and it was felt that these residents would suffer a serious detrimental impact. Traffic was currently over capacity at the A23/Cross Oak Lane junction and the lanes to the east of the site, the NPPF was quoted. When the already permitted Westvale Park housing was to be completed this would exacerbate the situation. The type of traffic using this site would be more HGV based. The impact on the road network would be severe and the following condition was suggested should the Committee approve the application. "To require regulation of site traffic being prevented from using the access routes through The Acres and Langshott developments and the country lanes in the wider Salfords and Sidlow area."

Paul Shuker, the Agent, spoke in support of the application, stating the applicant has worked collaboratively with key officers, statutory consultees, and local residents. The project would deliver a sustainable economic led repurposing of an existing allocated site and would continue and retain an economic base at this allocation. The applicant fully endorses the case officer's report and its conclusions in that it fully satisfies the principal planning policies in the local plan and the NPPF. The continued concerns were acknowledged, however they had been addressed through redesign and re-consultations. These have all been validated independently by statutory consultees and technical experts in their respected fields. The issue of sunlight and daylight had also been considered. Current proposals had been reduced by 10% from that originally submitted, despite the larger scheme still satisfying BRE guidance. The proposals have been benchmarked against other employment schemes in the defined employment area and were found to be consistent in scale, character and setting. The negligible amenity impact is further reduced by the retention of existing green infrastructure around the perimeter of site. The design sought to retain existing embedded bio-diversity. At the same time this green infrastructure retains the local character of Bonehurst Road. Surrey County Council independently reviewed the evidence and found the scheme to be acceptable on highway policy grounds. The proposal fully satisfied Policy TAP1 of the Local Plan. The economic benefits to the borough were outlined.

Following a vote, it was **RESOLVED** that the application be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee so that reasons for refusal can be considered.

8. 21/03185/F - OLDBURY ENGINEERING LTD, 8 - 12 BALCOMBE ROAD, HORLEY

The Committee considered an application at Oldbury Engineering Ltd, 8 - 12 Balcombe Road, Horley for the Demolition of all existing building and erection of a detached building containing 6 apartments with associated access, parking for car and cycles, refuse storage and amenity space. As amended on 22/02/2022 and on 16/05/2022.

Reasons for refusal were proposed by Councillor Stevens and seconded by Councillor Baker, whereupon the Committee voted and **RESOLVED** that planning permission be **REFUSED** on the grounds that:

1. The proposed development by virtue of its modern flat roofed design, high eaves adjacent to its neighbour and second floor bulk would appear jarring and incongruous with the adjacent properties and fail to reflect the local distinctiveness of the area, harmful to its character. This would be contrary to Policy DES1 of the Development Management Plan 2019 and advice contained within the Local Distinctiveness Design Guide SPD 2021 and National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development by virtue of the small private and communal outdoor areas would fail to provide adequate amenity space for its occupants thereby failing to achieve acceptable quality living conditions contrary to policy DES5 of the Development Management Plan 2019 and advice contained within the National Planning policy Framework.
3. The proposed development fails to provide sufficient parking to meet the parking standards set out in Annex 4 of the Development Management Plan which, without any evidence to the contrary would lead to the increased potential for on-street parking in areas where demand for spaces is high, leading to amenity issues for existing and potential residents contrary to Policies DES1 and TAP1 of the Development Management Plan 2019.

9. 21/02438/F - SALFORDS VILLAGE STORE, 21 BRIGHTON ROAD, SALFORDS

The Committee considered an application at Salfords Village Store, 21 Brighton Road, Salfords for the Demolition of existing convenience store building and redevelopment involving the erection of a convenience store (Class E) with associated parking and landscaping. As amended on 15/03/2022, 16/03/2022 and on 28/04/2022.

Jim Blackmore, Vice-Chair of Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application, raising concerns regarding the suitability of the site for a busy convenience store; highway safety in relation to vehicle movements at this busy junction associated with deliveries; the accident record in proximity to site and noise and disturbance to neighbours associated with deliveries and late night shoppers. It was explained that there was little onsite parking provided and parking in Honeycrock Lane was restricted by yellow lines and dropped kerbs. The plans showed that there were traffic islands in the middle of the A23 Brighton Road and Honeycrock Lane both of which could restrict the traffic going into and out of the site, in particular HGVs. The swept path analyses in the Mayer Brown Stage 1 Road Safety Audit showed the difficulty long and/or multi-axle lorries would have getting into and out of the site. This was a significant matter at this junction, which has a long history of road accidents. This analysis was not shown in the committee report. The report did not recognise the need to avoid noise nuisance to the neighbouring residential properties and only comments on internal plant at the south of the building. It was felt that there should be a condition that no noisy machinery be located near the neighbouring residential properties or it must have adequate sound attenuation. With deliveries arriving any time between 6am and 10 pm, delivery vehicles should be required to enter and leave in forward gear and avoid reversing warning sounders. Whenever possible the engines of the delivery vehicles should be switched off.

Sarah Isherwood, the Agent, spoke in support of the application stating the site currently contained a dilapidated convenience store which had been vacant for some time. It had been vandalised and was detracting from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal sought to bring the site back into use as a new store to serve the local community which was accessible on foot and would reduce the need to travel, improving the sustainability of the area for existing and future residents. This point was supported by some local residents and there was support relating to job creation and economic growth. Concerns were raised regarding highway safety however following discussions with Surrey County Council Highways team, amendments were made to the proposals including the submission of a road safety audit to demonstrate that the proposals would not have an impact on highway safety. An additional planning condition was proposed to secure a Delivery and Servicing Management Plan which would include specific details on the management of the delivery bay. This condition ensured the Local Planning Authority could assess and approve the details around how the Co-Op would operate the site based on the principles set out within the application. Subject to the conditions set out, Surrey County Council Highways did not raise any objection to the proposals. The proposals brought back into use a brownfield site within the local centre to provide a new Co-Op store to support the local community where there was currently no convenience store in easy walking distance. The development would improve the character and appearance of the area by providing a replacement building of an appropriate scale and design. No objections were raised by the Council's technical consultees.

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions as per the recommendation.

Officers to consider the need for asbestos conditions in future given the doubling of legislation, an informative was preferred.

10. **FIRST HOMES INTERIM POLICY STATEMENT**

The Head of Planning explained that this item had been deferred from the meeting held on 6 April 2022 in order to seek clarification on whether it should be considered initially by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Following advice from the Monitoring Officer, it was concurred that this was a matter for the Planning Committee.

An overview of the First Homes Interim Policy Statement was given, and it was explained that this was a Government policy, which as a local authority, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council were required to fulfil. The policy explained how affordable housing was to be introduced via the First Homes scheme.

The scheme would offer first time buyers (with associated criteria attached) the opportunity to purchase homes at a 30% discount. The 30% discount would remain in place for a property in the scheme for perpetuity. Local authorities could choose to apply a discount that was greater than 30% if it wished, however this would take away funding for other affordable homes that could be offered, and this authority did not wish to pursue this option.

The capped price for a home in the First Homes scheme would be £250,000 and this would apply to 1 and 2 bed properties. In terms of criteria of buyers, the Council

could set its own local connections policy, as well as an Armed Forces personnel connection. Other criteria were also set out.

It was questioned as to how future sales would be managed in light of the 30% discount remaining for perpetuity. It was explained that the Council's housing officers would work to manage subsequent sales and purchases. It was acknowledged that the Council would incur costs for undertaking this and this would take up officer time.

In respect of the item not being considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, it was explained that this was not within the scope for that Committee.

It was requested that a report be brought back by officers, to this Committee, to consider the Policy's implementation within the next year.

RESOLVED that:

- I. Note the requirements of this new national planning housing policy, and the need to apply it in the borough as set out in this Interim Policy Statement;
- II. Note the recommended local eligibility criteria;
- III. Grant delegated authority to the relevant Heads of Service alongside portfolio holders to amend this Interim Policy Statement as required to reflect lessons learnt through its implementation; and
- IV. Officers to bring report back to Committee within a year to review implementation.

11. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

The Meeting closed at 10.28 pm